



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/424,210	11/22/1999	JON TSCHUDI	2036-170	7676
6449	7590	07/10/2003		
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER LAROSE, COLIN M	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 07/10/2003	

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/424,210	TSCHUDI, JON
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Colin M. LaRose	2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): claim 17 under 35 USC 103.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a)  approved or b)  disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 5. Regarding the rejections under 35 USC 112, Applicant's remarks and attached affidavit have been considered but do not overcome the rejections concerning the features in question. The cited text of the Specification (p. 5, lines 19-35) does not fully disclose each and every claimed feature in question for claims 15, 20, 21, 24, and 25. Claim 18 is still believed to read on figures 7 and 8 of Setlak. Referring to figure 9, which further explains the operation of the sensor, capacitor 85 is an open circuit until the finger is place in near contact with the ground electrode 54 and sensing electrode 78. Thus, the varying voltage is present at the node between caps 83 and 85 before the circuit is completed by the finger. Applying the finger to both ground 54 and the AC voltage at the node (i.e. at electrode 78) produces a capacitive effect, allowing the AC current to flow through the finger to ground. Then the capacitive through the finger, which models the ridges and valleys of the fingerprint, is sensed and output for processing, as shown in figure 9. The rejections of claims 15-16 and 21-28 under 35 USC 102 and 103 are upheld. All of the features supported by the specification for these claims are taught by the cited references. Applicant's remarks pertaining to the claimed features in question not supported by the specification have been considered but are moot. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 17 are persuasive. The rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC 103 is withdrawn. Claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to both include the features of claim 15 and overcome the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 112.



AMELIA M. AU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600